

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-37 are pending. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are independent claims from which claims 3-10, 12-20 and 22-37 respectively depend. Claim 1 has been amended, incorporating the features of claim 2 therein. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1 and 3-37 will therefore be pending upon entry of the above amendments.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 10 have been rejected as being anticipated by Devillier (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,435). Claim 2 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Devillier in view of Cox (U.S. Patent No., 5,812,533). Claim 7 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Devillier in view of Griffiths (U.S. Patent No. 5,481,602). Claim 9 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Devillier in view of Madoch (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,409). Claims 11, 13-16, 21, 22, 24, 25, 32-35 and 37 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Ekstrom (U.S Patent No. 6,134,311) in view of Devillier. Claim 12 is rejected as being unpatentable over Ekstrom in view of Devillier and Malik (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,875). Claims 17, 27 and 28 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Ekstrom in view of Devillier and Madoch. Claims 18-20 and 29-31 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Ekstrom in view of Devillier and Bossemeyer, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,809). Claim 23 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Ekstrom in view of Devillier and Dugan (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,411). Claim 26 is rejected as being unpatentable over Ekstrom in view of Devillier and Cox. Claim 36 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Ekstrom in view of Devillier and Griffiths. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3-37, as amended herein, are patentably distinct from the cited references for the following reasons, among others.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 10 have been rejected as being anticipated by Devillier.

Applicants' amended claim 1 recites:

A method for providing audible caller information for calls routed from a first telephone station to a second telephone station via a switching network, comprising:
receiving a telephone call from the first telephone station directed to the second telephone station via the switching network;
determining information associated with the first telephone station from a database stored at a services control point, *the information comprising at least 50 characters of identifying information*; and
audibly communicating *the at least 50 characters of identifying information* associated with the first telephone station to the second telephone station.

Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Devillier because Devillier does not disclose or suggest at least the italicized features of Applicants' claim, as stated in Examiner's Official Action on page 4, paragraph 4: "Devillier fails to teach 'retrieving at least 50 characters of data from said database'." Clearly, having failed to retrieve at least 50 characters of identifying information, these at least 50 characters cannot be audibly communicated. Claims 3-6, 8, 10, as depending from allowable claim 1 are also allowable. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 102 rejections of these claims.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 has been rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Devillier in view of Cox. Claim 1 as amended incorporates the features of claim 2. The Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentably distinct and non-obvious from Devillier and Cox, alone or in combination, because it would not be obvious to combine Devillier and Cox, and even if combined, neither Devillier nor Cox disclose or suggest at least "audibly"

communicating *the at least 50 characters of identifying information* associated with the first telephone station to the second telephone station”, as required by amended claim 1.

Devillier describes a method to audibly announce an identified caller name by making a query to a database keyed by telephone number that includes line owners, but does not disclose receiving at least 50 characters of identification data and audibly announcing that at least 50 characters, as required by Applicants' amended claim 1.

Cox describes a service delivery infrastructure which makes it easier to provision telephony services. The service delivery infrastructure includes a database in which up to 50 characters are reserved in a user profile for subscriber name. The infrastructure including the database is used to provision sets of services to users in the communications network and interacts with billing and network management systems. (“The SDI [service delivery infrastructure] provides the basic service framework under which IN [intelligent network] services operate, presenting common interfaces to management and billing systems.” See Cox, column 9, lines 27-29.) No where is it disclosed that “*the at least 50 characters of identifying information* associated with the first telephone station” are audibly communicated to the second telephone station as required by Applicants’ amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Cox’s solution would not work when applied to Applicants’ problem space. Typical audio Caller Id systems rely on existing technology used by visual Caller ID systems. Visual Caller ID information is limited by the display characteristics of the display unit, which is unable to display 50 or more characters of data, and audio systems receive their information from the visual system and so is similarly limited. Maintaining 50 characters of data for a name field in a database does not remedy the problem because the technology on which the audio service relies is incapable of receiving that much information. Hence

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom are patentably distinct from the cited references and request the withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 10.

The deficiencies of Devillier and Cox are not remedied by Griffiths or Madoch. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 9 are allowable as depending from allowable claim 1 and request the withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 7 and 9.

Claims 11, 13-16, 21, 22, 24, 25 32-35, and 37 have been rejected as unpatentable over Ekstrom in view of Devillier. Claim 11 recites:

In an advanced intelligent network comprising a service switching point connected to a first telephone station, a plurality of services nodes each having interactive data systems, a service control point containing a database, and a second telephone station, a method of audibly providing information concerning the first telephone, comprising:

at the service switching point, forwarding a request to the service control point to identify one of the plurality of services nodes to handle a call from the first telephone station to the second telephone station;

at the service control point, identifying one of the plurality of services nodes to handle a call from the first telephone station to the second telephone station;

at the services node identified by the service control point, forwarding a request to the service control point to provide information associated with the first telephone station;

at the service control point, identifying information associated with the first telephone station from a database on said service control point;

at the services node identified by the service control point, receiving the information associated with the first telephone station from the service control point; and

at the services node, audibly announcing the information associated with the first telephone station to the second telephone station.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentably distinct and non-obvious from Ekstrom and Devillier, alone or in combination, because it would not be obvious to combine the Ekstrom and Devillier references, and even if combined, the application of the Ekstrom method to the Devillier objection would not result in a correct result.

(c) Ekstrom discloses a method in which a call directed to a subscriber of a Personal Access Service will be correctly terminated with one of several possible telephone number destinations depending upon a database at an SCN. As a result of encountering a TAT trigger at the SSP when a PAS subscriber is called, a query is sent to the SCP to determine an SCN associated with the called number. A PAS database on the designated SCN is accessed to determine the correct telephone number destination for the circumstances. The SCN is told to complete the call. When the SCN attempts to complete the call, the TAT trigger is encountered again, and the call is suspended. The calling number at this point is the line number of the SCN. Logic at the SCP determines that because the calling number in the query is the calling number of the SCN line, the call should be terminated to the original called number.

Devillier describes a method to audibly announce a calling party name by making a query to a database keyed on telephone number. The name associated with the calling party telephone number is audibly announced.

It would not be obvious to combine Ekstrom and Devillier because the problem spaces addressed by Ekstrom and Deviller are very different. PAS and audible caller ID are very different subscriber services, and thus the call logic is very different. Ekstrom's method applied to the problem space of Devillier would result in the audible communication of whatever the subscriber name field for the SCN contained.

Furthermore, even if Ekstrom and Devillier were combined, neither Ekstrom nor Devillier alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants independent claim 11. Neither Ekstrom nor Deviller disclose at least the following features of Applicants' claim 11:

at the services node identified by the service control point, forwarding a request to the service control point to provide information associated with the first telephone station;

Ekstrom does not request information from the SCP concerning the first telephone station (the calling party) but concerning the second telephone station (the PAS subscriber), hence Ekstrom's solution applied to Applicant's problem would result in the audible communication of the name associated with the SCN's telephone number. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claim 11 is allowable, as are claims 13-16 which depend therefrom and request the withdrawal of the rejections of these claims. Independent claim 21 recites an analogous feature to independent claim 11. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claim 21 is also allowable, as are claims 21, 22, 24, 25 32-35, and 37 depending therefrom. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

Neither Malik, Madoch, Bossemeyer, Dugan, nor Griffiths remedy the deficiencies of Ekstrom and Devillier. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12, 17-20, 23, 26 31 and 36 are allowable as depending from allowable claim 11 and 21 and request the withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of these claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and an early allowance is earnestly solicited.

DOCKET NO.: BELL-0048/00124
Application No.: 09/749,869
Office Action Dated: February 14, 2000

PATENT

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 14, 2003

Susan C Murphy
Susan C. Murphy
Registration No. 46,221

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439